

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 10, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 17, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a plurality of consumer networks located at a plurality of consumer locations, each consumer network including a controller and a consumer storage device.” In applying Zhou, the Examiner cites to element 10 as corresponding to the claimed consumer network and cites to element 220 as the claimed controller and element 250 as the consumer storage device. In Zhou, the controller 220 and memory 250 are not located at the consumer location. Rather, controller 220 and memory 250 are part of a broker 100 located remotely from the consumers 10. Thus, Zhou does not teach consumer networks having a controller and storage device as recited in claim 1.

Further, claim 1 recites “a grid computing platform including said controllers, said network processors, said consumer storage devices and said network storage devices, said grid computing platform providing storage of said content across network storage devices and consumer storage devices and distribution of said content to one or more of said consumer networks, said controllers, said network processors, said consumer storage devices and said network storage devices executing grid applications to provide distributed processing of content distribution tasks.” In applying Zhou, the Examiner states that a grid computing platform is taught, but there is no teaching in Zhou of network elements executing grid applications to provide distributed processing. Zhou teaches various network devices from the content provider to the consumer, but these devices do not operate in a grid computing platform to provide distributed processing as recited in claim 1. Thus, Zhou cannot anticipate claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Zhou. Claims 3, 4 and 17-19 variously depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Zhou for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2 and 5-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zhou in view of Kenner. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Kenner was relied upon for disclosing various content delivery options, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Zhou discussed above with reference to claim 1. Kenner teaches a variety of network elements, but makes no reference to grid applications or a grid computing platform. Claims 2 and 5-16 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Zhou in view of Kenner for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 1

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: November 29, 2007